Sherman was not referred to in Schurz's letters, doubtless because of the conviction, confirmed by Republican correspondents of the highest standing, like Morrill of Vermont, that, partisanship would sooner or later overcome any reforming impulses which Sherman might feel. Hayes' project of selecting one member from the South drew from Schurz the suggestion that the selection should be made from without the party lines—an idea which, though submitted with much doubt, was nevertheless acted upon by the President,

As early as December Mr. Schurz had received an intimation from General J. D. Cox, that Hayes had Schurz in mind for the Cabinet, in case the disputed count should be decided in favor of the Republicans. In February, when such a decision had become highly probable and Hayes' intentions toward Schurz had been confirmed, Schurz urged Murat Halstead to press Hayes to appoint Bristow, rather than Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury. Halstead characteristically replied: " You suggest that I go to Columbus to meet Hayes and talk Bristow. I saw him here and talked Schurz. . . . Sherman for the Treasury engaged certain. It does not seem worth while to combat the inevitable. . . . I was very urgent with Hayes to appoint you and ascertained that he had an opinion that there was no premiership in the Secretary of State,, and he thought there was more room for civil-service reform work in the Interior than in the War

Department. . . . Is there some danger that if you went into the Cabinet you would be a disturbing element? How would you get along with Sherman if Evarts, Hawley and Harlan were in? The Governor's remarks in reply to my urgency would be agreeable reading, but I do not feel at liberty to recite them."

Shortly afterward, on February 25th, Hayes wrote to